UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,886	02/27/2002	Dan Kikinis	007287.00017	7769
22907 BANNER & W	7590 12/22/200 ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STRI		SCHNURR, JOHN R		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2421	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/085,886	KIKINIS, DAN			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		JOHN SCHNURR	2421			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)[\	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Au	iaust 2000				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 August 2009</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
′=	<i>,</i> —					
٥/١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	closed in accordance with the practice under L	x parte Quayle, 1900 C.D. 11, 40	0.0.210.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🛛	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 18-25</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)🖂	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 18-25</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
ا ال		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment After Non-Final Rejection filed 08/26/2009. Claims 1-12 and 18-25 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/26/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument (Remarks pgs. 6-7) that Klarfeld (US 2003/0067554) does not disclose "determining a plurality of demographic profiles as determined by different behavior peaks indicated by the second set," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Klarfeld discloses creating user profiles for multiple users based on a user action history database. As can be seen in figure 36 each pattern record is mapped in n-dimensional space showing the significance of this pattern record. Based on the distribution of these records ("peeks") the system creates user profiles. ([0226]-[0235]) It is again noted that applicant's argument regarding the contiguous nature of the groupings is immaterial to the rejection.

In response to applicant's argument (Remarks pg. 7) that Knee (US 2002/0095676) does not disclose "removing a category from the second set in response to the broadcasted program viewing device not being tuned, for a period of time at least equal to a second predetermined threshold, to at least one broadcasted program predetermined to be in the category from the second set," the examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted by applicant Knee discloses

refreshing the demographic categories after a predetermined time threshold. This is performed to keep the user information current so that categories not viewed recently could be removed. ([0044])

In response to applicant's arguments (Remarks pg. 8) against the Schaffer (US 2002/0104087) reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClard (US 6,438,752) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0028871), herein Wang, in view of Knee et al. (US 2002/0095676), herein Knee and further in view of Klarfeld et al. (US 2003/0067554), herein Klarfeld.

Referring to **claim 1**, McClard teaches a method performed by a processor comprising:

adding a category from a first set of broadcasted programs provided by a media provider (Head-end server 34 provides media and category information, column 4 lines 27-39.) to a second set of categories of broadcasted programs in response to a broadcasted program viewing device being tuned, for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold, to a broadcasted program predetermined to be in the category from the

Application/Control Number: 10/085,886

Art Unit: 2421

first set (Column 4 lines 64-67 and Figure 3 element 54 teaches storing program category information in the memory and Column 5 lines 52-67 and Column 6 lines 1-9 teaches that when a program is watched for a period of time the program is added to a frequency watch list in memory 56 of Figure 3 and along with the program name the type/genre is added to memory 56 thus the category of a program is added from a first set of categories in memory 54 to a second set of data that includes categories in memory 56);

However, McClard does not explicitly teach updating the second set in response to a plurality of broadcasted programs being tuned for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold.

In an analogous art, Wang, which discloses a system for collecting viewing information, clearly teaches updating a second set in response to a plurality of broadcasted programs being tuned for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold. (Session time is added to total time and if total time is greater than a predetermined threshold the preference profile is updated, [0034].)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of McClard by updating the second set in response to a plurality of broadcasted programs being tuned for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold, as taught by Wang, for the benefit of determining channel surfer preferences ([0034] Wang).

McClard further teaches creating multiple profiles. (column 5 lines 19-41) McClard combined with Wang fails to teach determining a demographic profile based on the second set; and selecting a first advertisement based on the demographic profile.

In an analogous art, Knee teaches determining a demographic profile based on the second set (Paragraphs [0029] and [0030] and Figure 2 teach determining demographic categories for a user; Paragraph [0036] teaches that a show's category is used determine a user's demographic profile); and selecting a first advertisement based on the demographic profile (Paragraph [0050] teaches determining an advertisement from the user demographic profile).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the category set moving method McClard combined with Wang using the demographic profiling and advertisement determination method of Knee for the purpose of categorizing user

information into demographic categories that could then be used for specified purposes, such as for targeting advertisements or taking certain actions in the program guide (Paragraph [0007], Knee).

However, McClard combined with Wang and Knee does not explicitly teach each demographic profile corresponds to a different user, as determined by behavior peaks indicated by the second set.

In an analogous art, Klarfeld, which discloses a system for personalizing television, clearly teaches each demographic profile corresponds to a different user, as determined by different behavior peaks indicated by the second set. (Paragraphs [0226], [0230] and Figure 36 teach creating multiple profiles corresponding to multiple users and determining user profiles based on the observed behavior of the users.)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of McClard combined with Wang and Knee by determining a plurality of demographic profiles by analyzing behavior peaks indicated by the second set, as taught by Klarfeld, for the benefit of simplifying the profile system for the user ([0226] Klarfeld).

Referring to **claim 4**, depending on claim 1, Knee teaches receiving a set of advertisements including the first advertisement (**Paragraph [0023]**).

Referring to **claim 5**, depending on claim 1, Knee teaches removing a category from the second set in response to the broadcast program viewing device not being tuned for a period of time at least equal to a second predetermine threshold, to at least one broadcasting program predetermined to be in the category from the second set **(Paragraph [0044])**.

Referring to claim 7, see the rejection of claim 1; (McClard Figure 3 teaches element 50 a processor and element 52 is memory according to Column 4 lines 54-61; Knee teaches Figure 1 and elements 64 memory and 60 a microprocessor according to Paragraph [0028].)

Referring to **claim 10**, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 4.

Referring to **claim 11**, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 5.

Referring to **claim 18**, depending on claim 1, Wang teaches adding a category from a first set of broadcasted programs provided by a media provider to a second set of categories of broadcasted programs in

response to multiple selectings of at least one broadcasted program predetermined to be in the category from the first set. ([0034])

Referring to claim 19, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 18.

Page 6

Referring to claim 20, depending on claim 1, McClard teaches adding a category from the first set to the second set of categories in response to a selecting of the category from the first set. (Column 5 lines 52-67 and Column 6 lines 1-9 teaches that when a program is watched for a period of time the program is added to a frequency watch list in memory 56 of Figure 3 and along with the program name the type/genre is added to memory 56 thus the category of a program is added from a first set of categories in memory 54 to a second set of data that includes categories in memory 56 when the category is selected by tuning the program.)

Referring to **claim 21**, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 20.

Referring to claim 22, depending on claim 1, McClard teaches increasing a weight value of a category based on a duration of viewing time for at least one broadcast program in that category (Column 6 lines 5-9 teaches if the user watches a particular program for a predetermined period of time the genre is stored in frequency memory 56.); and wherein the step of determining a plurality of demographic profiles includes utilizing weight values for categories to determine said demographic profiles. (Column 6 line 62 to Column 7 line 7 teaches the weight of the genre for a particular time period is used in the user profile.)

Referring to **claim 23**, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 22.

Referring to **claim 24**, depending on claim 1, Knee teaches removing a category from the second set in response to a selection of the category from the second set (**Categories which have not been viewed are selected to be removed [0044].)**.

Referring to **claim 25**, depending on claim 7, see the rejection of claim 24.

5. Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClard (US 6,438,752 B1) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0028871) in view of Knee et al. (US 2002/0095676) further in view of

Application/Control Number: 10/085,886

Art Unit: 2421

Klarfeld et al. (US 2003/0067554), as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Ellis et al. (US 2003/0020744), herein Ellis.

Referring to **claim 2**, depending on claim 1, McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld fail to teach displaying the first advertisement with an interactive programming guide.

In an analogous art Ellis teaches displaying the first advertisement with an interactive programming guide (Paragraphs [0125] and [0126] teach selecting an advertisement and Paragraph [0110] teaches using viewer history to determine which advertisements to use in the program guide, Figure 5 elements 108).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the combined methods of McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld using the targeted advertisement display method of Ellis for the purpose of providing users a user customized program guide experience (Paragraph [0010], Ellis).

Referring to **claim 3**, depending on claim 1, McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld fail to teach transmitting the second set to a unit at a head end of a broadcasting system.

In an analogous art Ellis teaches transmitting the second set to a unit at a head end of a broadcasting system (Paragraphs [0125] and [0126] and Figure 2b teach transmitting the user history to the program guide server element 25).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the combined methods of McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld using the transmission of recorded user history data to the head end of Ellis for the purpose of providing users' a user customized program guide experience (Paragraph [0010], Ellis).

Referring to **claim 8**, depending on claim 7, see rejection of claim 2.

Referring to **claim 9**, depending on claim 7, see rejection of claim 3.

6. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClard (US 6,438,752 B1) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0028871) in view of Knee et al. (US 2002/0095676) further in view of

Application/Control Number: 10/085,886

Art Unit: 2421

Klarfeld et al. (US 2003/0067554), as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Schaffer et al. (US 2002/0104087), herein Schaffer.

Consider **claim 6**, McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld, combined as in claim1, clearly teach adding a category from a first set to a second set.

However, McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld do not explicitly teach verifying profile updates with a viewer.

In an analogous art, Schaffer, which discloses a system for maintaining a user profile, clearly teaches verifying profile updates with a viewer. (The feedback request command queries the user about a program being watched, [0048].)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of McClard, Wang, Knee and Klarfeld by verifying profile updates with a viewer, as taught by Schaffer, for the benefit of maximizing the performance of a television recommender ([0010] Schaffer).

Referring to **claim 12**, depending on claim 7, see rejection of claim 6.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN SCHNURR whose telephone number is (571)270-1458. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9a-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tollfree). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

JRS